

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
COLUMBIA DIVISION

DAVID MILLS

v.

C.C.A., et al.

)
)
)
)
)

NO. 1:10-0015

ORDER

The Court is in receipt of two letters from the Plaintiff, seeking information on the status of this case and a copy of the Local Rules of Court (Docket Entry Nos. 42 and 50).

The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of the docket sheet and the Local Rules of this Court to the Plaintiff.

The Plaintiff has also inquired about the status of service of summons on the defendants and the "next step." See Docket Entry No. 32. The status of service on the defendants, along with the schedule for the progression of this case, is addressed by separately entered order.

On June 1, 2010, the Plaintiff filed a "Response in Opposition to the Defendant's Answer" (Docket Entry No. 48), in which he seeks dismissal of the answer filed by Defendants Bass, Boyd, Brantly, C.C.A., Cogswell, Hendrix, Killingsworth, Kilzer, Leibach, Lindamood, McKintosh, Pool, Riley, Strickland, and Ulmer (Docket Entry No. 39). Such request is DENIED. An answer does not operate to dismiss any claims of the Plaintiff but rather sets forth the Defendants' position on the claims asserted by the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff will have the opportunity to oppose any motion seeking to dismiss the Plaintiff's claims if and when such motion is filed by those Defendants.

On June 1, 2010, Defendants T.D.O.C., Ray, and Reuban have filed a motion to dismiss (Docket Entry No. 46).

The Plaintiff shall have until July 1, 2010, to file a response to the motion. The plaintiff is warned that his failure to file a response to the motion by July 1, 2010, could result in a recommendation that his claims against Defendants T.D.O.C., Ray, and Reuban be dismissed.

It is so ORDERED.


JULIET GRIFFIN
United States Magistrate Judge